



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

evidently rests on hearsay. Grimm (*Andreas und Elene*, p. iii) does, as he considers, tardy justice to the name of Dr. Blume by dedicating his edition to him; he says nothing, however, about the origin of the text which is the basis of the first edition, and in consequence of his own and Kemble's. Later commentators have uniformly followed Kemble; Wülker (*Grundriss*, p. 240; see also p. 55), for example, credits Dr. Blume with the discovery of the manuscript, and also with the first transcription of the poetical portions of it.

Dr. Blume's own statement with regard to the matter appears hitherto to have been overlooked. In the fourth volume of his *Iter Italicum*, p. 133, Halle, 1836, which appeared the same year as *Mr. Cooper's Report*, we find the following supplementary note to vol. i, p. 99, at which place, twelve years before, Dr. Blume had announced the discovery of the manuscript:

"Das angelsächsische Homiliarium ist vor Kurzem auf Veranstaltung Englischer Geschichtsforscher, von (dem nun schon verstorbenen) Dr. Maier vollständig abgeschrieben worden; es haben sich wichtige angelsächsische Lieder darin gefunden (Jac. Grimm)."

Evidently then Dr. Blume's knowledge of the contents of the manuscript, beyond the general impression that it was a book of homilies, was not derived through reading it. How innocent he was of any understanding of Anglo-Saxon can be seen from his attempted transcription of the opening lines of the homily on the *Purification of the Virgin* (quoted by Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 240).

It follows that we must free the shade of Dr. Blume from the charge (Wülker, *Codex Vercellensis*, p. viii; Skeat, *English Miscellany*, p. 409) of having defaced the interesting fragment on f. 54^a, which contains the runes forming the name of Cynewulf. But it does not follow, I think, that the blame is to be passed on to Dr. Maier. An examination of the manuscript in Wülker's photographic reproduction makes it plain that this folio, when it left the hands of the original scribe, was as clean and perfect as any other folio of the manuscript; for, in some places, the original writing can be clearly seen under the blot. If Dr. Maier was able to read the other folios of the manuscript without the

help of chemical re-agents, he should have had no difficulty in reading this one. The blot which now disfigures the folio extends somewhat slantingly from right to left through all except the last line of the folio; in width it covers about one third of the lines and is serrate at the edges. Now any re-agent which a reader might use in order more easily to decipher the manuscript would not be applied in such a way as to make a blot of the kind described. The blot evidently was on the manuscript when the first copy was made. For this reason Dr. Maier probably did not attempt to transcribe this folio; in consequence it did not appear in the first edition of the manuscript, and the poem of which it supposedly formed a part was printed by Thorpe as "a fragment." The most plausible explanation of the blot seems to be that of Siever's (*Anglia* xiii, p. 25): after the scribe had copied out the lines on f. 54^b, either he himself or some later reader thought it necessary to strike out what was there written, and the blot is a mark of his disapproval.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP.

Columbia University.

"MOBLED QUEEN," *Hamlet*, ii, 2.

A note may be added to the Furness Variorum comment upon *mobled*. Sir Henry Ellis's edition of Brand's *Antiquities*, vol. iii, p. 397 (Bohn) has a Warwickshire use of *mab-led*, pronounced *mob-led*, the expression meaning 'led astray by a Will o' the wisp.' Earlier editions of the play read *mob-led* where the accepted text to-day has *mobled*. This reading was noted by a writer in *Notes and Queries*, third series, vi, 66. In the same volume, p. 180, P. S. C. adds the following:

"I am old enough to remember what a mob cap was, and I have no doubt that *mobled* means *muffled up*. The whole description clearly applies to the Queen's outward appearance, and not to the state of her mind. 'Mob-led' was nothing but 'clap-trap' that came into vogue among second-rate actors in country towns about the year 1830, being meant as a hit at Queen Caroline. Low as the joke was, it seldom failed to draw applause from the good people who flattered themselves that in siding with the King's Majesty they were upholding the cause of sound morality; and when the empty Polonius added in his oracular

manner—"Mob-led is good"—it amuses me still to think how they clapped and grunted. Little did I imagine that I should live to see this miserable piece of buffoonery trotted out in the garb of sober criticism."

'St. Swithin' on page 342 of the same series recalls the Warwickshire use noted in Brand, and adds a reference to Longstaffe, who in his *History of Darlington*, page 14, gives a long list of aliases borne by the *ignis fatuus*.

"The Warwickshire poet may have applied the word to Hecuba because she ran wildly about, *mab-led*, or *mob-led*, as it were, by the dreadful fascination of the flames."

Mob-led finds no favor with conservative editors. *Mobled* is clearly defined in the *Oxford Shakespeare* as 'having the head bound up.' Still the use noted in Brand and in Longstaffe should be given in an examination of the text. To these examples I add another from Allies's *Antiquities and Folk Lore of Worcestershire* (1856):

"'Oh then I see Queen Mab, etc.'"

So said the immortal bard, and I was curious to ascertain whether her majesty had honoured the fair Midlands with her presence. That she had done so will appear as follows: There is a piece of ground near the village of Upton Snodsbury, in Worcestershire, called Mob's Close, or Mop's Close; and an orchard at Hale's End, near Herold's Copse, in Cradley, in Herefordshire, adjoining the western side of Old Storage, in Worcestershire, called Mabbled Pleck,¹ meaning Mab led Pleck, or a plat where one was liable to be mab-led."

After giving the reference to Brand, Allies continues:

"The place in Cradley was in early times called Little Pleck, afterwards Mablee Pleck, and subsequently Mabbled Pleck, as appears by the title deeds of Richard Yapp, Sen. Esq., the owner of the estate" (p. 437).

Such a use might be explained, perhaps, as a popular extension of Queen Mab's powers; or again, as it was pronounced *mob*, as perhaps connected with some French form in *mob* (mobilis): but why, if the latter supposition, should the word have been written *mab*?

W. P. REEVES.

Kenyon College.

¹ A country term for a small piece of ground.

GOLDSMITH AND THE NOTIONS Grille AND Wandler IN WERTHERS LEIDEN.

It is the aim of the following discussion to throw light on the signification of these words in Goethe's novel, and to show that the two are causally related. The final determination of their meaning would, of course, require, according to a well-known canon of exegesis,¹ an exhaustive investigation of the literature at and preceding the period when *Werther* was written. This is not the scope of the present essay, which, limiting itself to an examination of Goldsmith's writings and those of Goethe in the Werther period, endeavors to prove that, whatever might be the result of a more comprehensive research, Goldsmith must be taken into account; and that German scholars, and those very eminent ones, have in the present instance failed to do so. In my argument, appeal is also made to the external evidence of Goethe's autobiography; for, though composed much later and containing *Dichtung* as well as *Wahrheit*, it was confessedly written to aid in the interpretation of the author's works, and is in the case before us strongly supported by the internal testimony of the writings in question. The familiar accounts of Goethe's relations to Herder and Goldsmith, found in DW,² and in the histories of German literature, it is hardly necessary here to reiterate.

A remark made by Goethe in the autobiography forms my point of departure. To

¹ Alles was noch einer näheren Bestimmung bedarf in einer gegebenen Rede, darf nur aus dem dem Verfasser und seinem ursprünglichen Publikum gemeinsamen Sprachgebiet bestimmt werden.—Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutik*.

² The abbreviations here used are:

DW. *Dichtung und Wahrheit*.

WA. I. (II., III., IV.) Goethes Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe, Abteilung 1 (2, 3, 4). The volume containing *Werther* (I., vol. 19), is cited WA. without further specification.

RRG. *Richardson, Rousseau und Goethe* von Erich Schmidt. Jena, 1875.

DjG. *Der junge Goethe* von Michael Bernays. Leipzig, 1875.

HA. Goethes Werke, Hempelsche Ausgabe.

AGF. *Aus Goethes Frühzeit* von Wilhelm Scherer. Strassburg, 1879.

Erl. *Goethe's Leiden des jungen Werthers* erläutert von Heinrich Düntzer. Leipzig, 1880.